

## REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office action dated April 18, 2005, and have made amendments to the claims and specification. Claim 12 has been amended for an informality. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, in view of the amendments and the following remarks, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Objections to the Disclosure

The disclosure was objected to because of the following informalities: On page 5, paragraph [30], lines 2 and 3, --or-- should be placed after "spherical", or "non-spherical" on line 3 should be omitted. On page 6, paragraph [35], line 1, "screen 12" should be --screen 13--.

In response, applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the objections to the disclosure be withdrawn.

### Objections to the Claims

Claim 12 was objected to because of the following informality: On line 7 of claim 12, "an" should be --a--. In response, applicants have amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,388,810 to Monson et al. ("Monson et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitation of a convex mirror, as recited in claim 12, positioned opposite the projection lens renders the claim allowable over the prior art. Specifically, the combination allows the thickness of the projection system to be remarkably reduced because light projected in a direction parallel to the screen takes up a minimum amount of space.

Monson et al. teaches a planar mirror being positioned opposite the projection lens. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a convex mirror in place of a planar or non-spherical mirror positioned opposite the projection lens in the projector system of

Monson et al. Without the benefit of Applicants' disclosure, one skilled in the art would not use a convex mirror in place of the planar mirror positioned opposite the projection lens of Monson et al. because use of such a mirror would add to the overall size of the projector system. As stated in column 2, lines 8-15 of Monson et al., the purpose of Monson et al. is to create a compact projection system that operates in a confined area, or an area of limited space.

Accordingly, because the use of a convex mirror opposite the projections lens of Monson et al. increases the projector system's size, the very purpose of Monson et al. is defeated. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to use a convex mirror opposite the projection lens of Monson et al. Applicants respectfully request that claim 12, and the claims dependent therefrom, be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.


No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Date: July 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lew Edward V. Macapagal  
Registration No. 55,416  
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka  
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: 213-623-2221  
Facsimile: 213-623-2211